

Serial No. 09/801,000  
Amdt. dated September 27, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2004

Docket No. P-0196

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussions is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the present application. By this Amendment, claims 1-8 are amended and claims 9-14 are added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification, drawings, and claims were objected to, and claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The specification, drawings and claims have been amended in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action. For example, Figure 2 has been amended to include the serial-to-parallel converters recited in claims 1 and 6, and the specification has been amended to include reference numerals for the first and second serial-to-parallel converters. A minor change at page 8 has also been implemented. Further, the claims have also been amended to address the comments noted in item 3 of the Office Action.

Further, regarding the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Office Action indicates the specification does not teach how to make the signal output from the digital combiner twice using a digital signal processor. It is respectfully noted independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite that the base station transmitter includes a digital signal processor for converting the digital base-band CDMA signals into parallel signals with a first data rate and for outputting the parallel signals with a second data rate that is twice a data

Serial No. 09/801,000  
Amdt. dated September 27, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2004

Docket No. P-0196

rate of the first data rate. These features are discussed in the specification at least at page 7, lines 9-13 and lines 20-24. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, new claims 9-14 have been added to set forth the invention in a varying scope and Applicant submits that the new claims are supported by the originally filed specification. In particular, new independent claim 9 is similar to independent claim 1, but does not include all of the elements recited in claim 1 and has been drafted in a varying scope.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David A. Bilodeau**, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 09/801,000

Docket No. P-0196

Amdt. dated September 27, 2004

Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2004

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 34,596  
David A. Bilodeau  
Registration No. 42,325

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK/DAB/JHK:ae  
**Date: September 27, 2004**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**



FIG. 2

